Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/073,948	RHOADES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	KEITH VICARY	2183
All Participants:	Status of Application: RCE Filed	
(1) KEITH VICARY.	(3)	
(2) <u>John Guay</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 24 June 2010	Time: Afternoon	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I. Rejection(s) discussed: None specifically		
Claims discussed: 1, 2, 32, 52, 53, 56		
Prior art documents discussed: None specifically		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.		
/Eddie P Chan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2183	applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/073,948

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner conveyed to applicant's representative that he believed that the claims would be in condition for allowance if the independent claim were amended in a particular way to overcome the current rejection and possible future rejections which incorporated additional prior art, and if various further minor claim amendments were made. Examiner cited various portions of the instant specification as the basis for the proposed change to the independent claim, including page 20, lines 27-28, 49/29-31, 20/33, and 53/18-30. Applicant's representative conveyed his intention of contacting the applicant regarding the proposed changes. On July 9, 2010, Applicant's representative conveyed authorization for a set of amendments similar to those proposed and which examiner determined would likewise overcome the prior art of record. Applicant's representative later conveyed authorization for very minor formal changes to the claims on July 11, 2010.

KV.